



## Event Transcript

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| <b>Project:</b> | East Midlands Gateway Phase 2            |
| <b>Event:</b>   | Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) – Part 4 |
| <b>Date:</b>    | 11 March 2026                            |

**Please note:** This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above event. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the event.

# Issue Specific Hearing 1 - 11\_3\_26 - Session 4

Wed, Mar 11, 2026 3:44PM 1:11:53

## SUMMARY KEYWORDS

Traffic modelling, mezzanines, HGV distribution, local road network, strategic road network, sustainable transport strategy, public transport links, travel plan, funding, mitigation measures, road safety audits, travel plan fund, bus fund, stakeholder consultation, future proofing.

## SPEAKERS

Speaker 1, Speaker 9, Speaker 4, Speaker 5, Speaker 2, Speaker 6, Speaker 8, Speaker 3, Speaker 7

---

 00:51

It's now quarter two, so the hearing is resumed. Obviously, we're looking at how we're doing in relation to today and getting through all the items on the agenda, and we're slightly concerned that we're not going to be able we're not going to be able to get through everything as we previously anticipated. Therefore, we were thinking about doing as much as we could to between now and five o'clock and then the journey until after the ish two tomorrow. We were just wondering whether that would cause anybody any difficulties. So who, anybody who is here today who would not be able to, who would feel disadvantaged any way, shape or form, not to be able to because they wouldn't be unable to come back tomorrow after the issue specific hearing two yes at the back, please remember that tomorrow, is to do with the morning is going to be very much to do with about the development consent order, the material change order, the drafting thereof. Yes, Mr.

 01:50

Sutton, very certain resident. I fully understand the position, sir, and I feel that, given that we are going to begin on traffic and transport now that there will be ample opportunity, but I cannot come tomorrow. Thank you.

 02:04

Okay, well, we'll see how we're going. We might put see how we're going, and it may be Mr. Sutton, we pull you in to allow you to say your piece at that sort of just before, sort of about 10 to five, or something like that, which might be a way around that you being unable to be here, to be here tomorrow, so, but we'll start anyway and see how far we get. Okay, you'll have all seen from the agendas, there's quite a lot to go through. And I hope the answer to some of this will be relatively straightforward, mostly an update, particularly the applicant and the highway authorities, as to where we've got to now. We do have, although we're discussing traffic and transport today, we do have further questions that we think we better in written form because often because they're very specific. So please don't assume just because we haven't asked a question today on a particular matter, but we don't have questions where we will be asking to seek to have matters clarified equally. There have been matters raised in the relevant representations, particularly by the highway authorities, which we are unlikely to be asking questions this time, we'd expect the applicants to respond to the points in their responses to relevant representations, and for us to ask questions about it now would be an unnecessary duplication. Just making that point clear, the first thing I want to have a look at is relates to traffic modelling. Before I looking at the models used, I'd like to have a look at the inputs, that is, the traffic being added to the base models. And as I understand it, these are generally agreed with the remaining issue, relation to the question of mezzanines. The one thing which I do have want to I'd like to ask the applicant about before that, about tables 12 to 15 in the TA you don't need to get them up which deal with the various agreed, agree with the highway authorities, traffic generation rates. Can I just put the applicants on notice? I think there may be an error in the calculations in table 15 for the difference in HGV arrivals in the am peak. That's going to be subject to one of our written questions. However, that's more detailed than I'd like to talk about. Now I don't and I'm going to be talking about his concepts in table 15. You have agglomerated traffic generation from the two sites that is the EMG two site and the MCO site. What I'm concerned about is that normally, the analysis is essentially from a single source point where, of course, the proposals in table 15 are from two source points a kilometre or so apart. And I'm interested in whether that has any implications for the modelling

 04:47

the applicant, Alexander booth,

 04:51

so I can't assist you with that. Yeah, it may be that we need to come back in writing. But in terms of that specific point, in terms of tables 1215 I'm going to turn to Mr. Wilson, sat four to my right. But as I say, if he can't deal with it on the roof, we'll deal with it in writing. Am I right in understanding that, in addition to that, tables 1215 and the two source points issue, you also wish him to speak to the first bullet in the second list, proposed mezzanine floors. No, we'll come to that later. Okay, fine. So thank you, Mr.

 05:23

Wilson. Paul Wilson, on behalf of the applicant, so table 15 in particular considers mezzanines, and with some series of calculations that we used to hopefully prove that even by increasing the mezzanine levels over and above, excuse

 05:44

me, that's I haven't got to that. What I'm wondering, we're concerned about is the fact that the table 15 deals with a single source total, when, in fact, it is going on the network at two different points.

 06:01

You've got totals across and how that should work into the modelling.

 06:07

So, so Paul was for the applicant. So the 370, number at the top, which we can obviously come back and elaborate in writing, does include for the b8, and b2 elements, the numbers that are in table 15 haven't necessarily all been included for in the modelling. From what I recall, this was an exercise to inform the mezzanine, which I know you want to talk about separately, yeah,

 06:35

so you can elaborate further in writing.

 06:38

Can I ask the highway authorities whether they've got a view on this, essentially two sort two sources, when modelled as one,

 06:47

Harry horsey, Leicester county council highways. I believe in sorry, I believe I understand your point is in reference to how that quantum rate is loaded onto the network and then assigned. So in prtm terms, the distribution of traffic was agreed with stakeholders at the TWG, and a proportion of that was loaded on at the East Midlands gateway one site, and the wider proportion was loaded on at East Midlands gateway two site. And the assumptions for that were agreed with stakeholders prior to their use. And the important aspect of that that may come up later is in terms of HGV distribution, because the HGV distribution was for the purposes of strategic modelling, assumed to be external to the site. So there was then a sensitivity test undertaken by the applicant team to overlay a manual distribution of those HEV traffic. There was an assumption between the the EMG one to EMG to interrelatedness of trips from the rail head element. So. So, in short, the methodology of that was done appropriately with regard to stakeholder input. And that number within the table for the 430,000 square metres was assigned to the network in appropriately from two points.

 08:03

That's that was the point I was trying to clarify, was whether it had been distributed. I'm assuming national highways are equally happy on that, on that response.

 08:13

Fiona Ahmed on behalf of National Highways, yes, national highways agree with the methodology that's been set out by Mr. Horsley, thank you.

 08:27

Right? The can I make? Also make a comment about how some of the data in the TA has been presented. For example, if you look at tables 12 to 15, they're all based on an in out arrangement. But those in table 26 are an out in arrangement, and some give total vehicles and HGVs. And others liked vehicles and HGVs. It took me a couple of hours on working on a spreadsheet to make sure there were signal significant inconsistencies. It does give the impression that this data is designed to confuse rather than else, rather than elucidate. If you could please have a look at it again to see if you can make it clearer. You so you are comparing apples with apples rather than apples and half a pair. Thank you. Right. Moving on to the mezzanines, we will all have a discussion about tomorrow, about the drafting of of the restrictions, but I would like to look at some more fundamental issues in strict planning terms, unless restricted. As far as I'm aware, there's nothing to present prevent any medicine floor being used in exactly the same way as the main use. On that base basis, could you I'd like the applicant to justify the 50% traffic generation figure for mezzanines.

 09:48

Please. Paul Wilson, on behalf of the applicant, in simplistic terms, obviously, the use of mezzanines is for vertical storage and stacking. And the primary trip generator associated with the mezzanines relates to the loading bays and the park and the HTV parking on the ground floor in effect. So as you can appreciate, you haven't got layers of loading bays as you go up, or additional HGV parking. It's that that underpins the traffic generation of the building itself, and therefore the mezzanine so you have less trips associated with with the mezzanines themselves.

 10:34

But it surely it relates to how long the goods are stored in the vehicle, in the in the premises, as to how many trips there are associated.

 10:46

I guess it's always challenging when you consider trip generation from mezzanines, because you can't build a unit ground floor, operate it, record the traffic, and then kind of build your mezzanine on top, and then look at the comparison. Hence why the approach we've adopted in the transport assessment by looking at EMG one, which obviously includes mezzanines, to give us a real flavour as to how a development of that nature would operate based on recent relevant information, if that makes sense. So we've tried to do as best as we can to understand the traffic that could be generated by the mezzanines, with them being included at EMG two. But to be clear, the way that the modelling work has been undertaken, we've shoot we've modelled 430,000 square metres gross floor area of development in total, which includes for 100,000 square metres of mezzanine space at full trip rates. It's that additional 100,000 square metres that gets you up to 530,000 square metres GFA in total, which is where, as you quite rightly say, we're suggesting that 50% reduction. We've obviously included the evidence table 15 in particular that you touched upon earlier. It's that area of the transport assessment that goes into it in detail and for hopefully for interest the likes of Northampton gateway, which is another SEGRO project, there was a 50% reduction agreed there. So this is not unique as an as a as a general assumption, but obviously we've tried to put some evidence behind why we think the trip rates are more than robust, and hence the approach we've adopted with regards to the mezzanines and the transport assessment and therefore the transport modelling.

 12:30

Can I have national highways comments on that please?

 12:38

Liam Ahmed, on behalf of National Highways, extensive discussions have been undertaken with the applicant to understand the usage of the mezzanine floor area from an operational point of view, the mezzanine floor is unlikely to be a chip generator in comparison to the land use of the ground floor. Therefore, this hasn't been quantified through further modelling, as the applicant just indicated how they should be noted that modelling, the modelling that's been undertaken today, is robust and doesn't account for the potential success of a travel plan. Additionally, the mezzanine floor has been dealt with through a separate agreement requirement, 27 which the which reflects the treatment in the modelling. The wording will probably come on to this a bit later, but the wording, I think, needs updating

 13:29

the model, the wording of the restriction

 13:30

tomorrow, yeah, sorry. The wording the requirement, yeah,

 13:34

does the county council haven't have a common

 13:38

Harry horsey for Leicester county council. Miss Ahmed makes a very important point in terms of the framework travel plan and the success thereof, and that shouldn't be ignored, because the trip rates that were calculated early on in our liaison with the applicant team originally from EMG one TA, and therefore don't take account of some of the Sustainable enhancements and opportunities that are provided. That said, in terms of the local road network impact, we have asked for the additional 100,000 square metres of mezzanine to be overlaid manually. This request came after we had also asked for the strategic modelling undertaken in prtm 23 to account for the full 530,000 square metres of BA which would provide you the complete certainty around potential residual impact of that growth on the network. And it's important there's whilst there's quite a detailed chronology of events and iterative process of modelling and supplementary work done which has been very much valued and appreciated by the applicant team, also where opportunity would have presented itself to capture that within the prtm, our perspective was that was the most appropriate way to do that. The decision was taken predominantly through justification of robustness of existing rates that that wasn't an appropriate thing to do. So in the absence of that, we've asked for a manual assessment of those 100,000 square metres worth of potential b8 trips, which, whilst again, we take myself, AV point around an evidence base has been suggested in terms of how those that land use could equate to trips on the network. From an LCC perspective, we wouldn't necessarily seen adequate justification to evidence that that couldn't, in fact, as per your original point, equate to a similar trip generator as per ground, ground floor, floor space. So, yeah, I think, I think, to summarise our our original perspective was it should be tested within prtm. It hasn't been. So in order to be pragmatic and collaborative and engage in the process. We've requested the manual assessment, which the applicant team are indeed doing.

 15:47

And going back to the app, how long do you think it's going to be until you've completed that assessment? It will be issued this week. So therefore, it was submitted into the exam at d1 correct. Thank you. That's okay. Thank you. So we'll see how that goes. Obviously, we'll have a discussion tomorrow, over the over the word word yes and Leicester, Leicester

 16:08

county council, Harry horsey, sorry, just to clarify that lrn assessment is not to consider the visit model that covers the SRN. It is for the local road network, therefore non trunk road network.

 16:19

Hence the difference between yourselves and the national and national highways. Correct? Okay.

 16:31

Do I need to do any more? One of the things I am interested to look at is how much traffic from the would would use on the EMG to site would be anticipated being associated with trips to and from the rail freight interchange, because going back to The EMG, one model that would some that traffic would have been assumed to be going into the wider network, outside the a 453, down to EMG to site. And what I'm interested in, though, is whether or not they would then affect if you've got double counting onto the wider network because traffic, which was assumed to go out onto the wider network now won't we'll just be troubling up and down the A, 453,

 17:29

and I'm whether there's been any analysis of that.

 17:34

Paul Wilson, on behalf of the applicant, yes, we've certainly taken that into consideration the way that prtm operates is that EMG one and EMG two in separate zones within the prtm model. Anyway, so prtm automatically included for an element of traffic between the two. Having said that, having discussed it in length with the transport working group, we we took it a step further and reviewed what was considered in the MG one transport assessment, which calculated that 30% of HGV traffic from EMG one was considered to be using would be using the rail freight terminal within the MG One. So therefore, we adopted a similar principle for EMG two, looked at the HGV traffic that would be generated in the peak hours, and then manually assigned that as a sensitivity test at the EMG one site access. So in a positive way, there's double counting to a degree in that prtm has included for an element of the rail freight terminal, but not as much as we think might be the case. So therefore it's robustly distributed traffic beyond the MG one up to the m1 and so on and so forth. So that's encapsulated in the modelling work and the vism modelling, but we've done a separate sensitivity test, which puts the 30% of HGV traffic generated by EMG two HGVs in and out of EMG one as well. So it ticks both boxes, and we've hopefully covered both angles, and it didn't prejudice the outcome of the original modelling work that we undertook.

 19:20

Is Leicestershire county council happy with that approach? Harry was

 19:23

ayeshire County Council. We're aware of that as the methodology that's intended, and we're aware that that will be submitted shortly for us to review, indeed, and it's linked also with the interoperability of the railhead to EMG to and cross movements of traffic, so stakeholders will have the opportunity to comment on that when it's submitted. Thank you.

 19:43

Paul Wilson, for the applicant. Can I just elaborate? Sorry, the transport assessment, which forms the core assessment of the DCO, is based on the 2019 prtm. So that is covered. We will. I'll confer with colleagues as to whether we're going to replicate that sensitivity test again in 2023

 20:04

just to complete that exercise,

 20:08

the third point I want to look on the traffic modelling relates to the MCO scheme, which obviously the applicant described in the original proposals as mine as minimal. Now we've obviously heard over the last couple of days that the county council has asked for further justification for that's probably a polite way of putting it, to say whether they they go any further. One of the things, however, could, if we could get the highways design document up, which is ap 211,

 20:50

and if you could then go to PDF page five,

 20:57

in paragraph 811,

 21:01

it says the capacity improvement on the Asics

 21:06

to the A six Kegworth bypass slash a 453, junction will cater for the additional development within the EMG one site and support the EMG two proposals. The bit I'm interested is the phrase cater for the additional development with the em g1 site, which I'm taking to be the MCO proposal. Could you explain that a little further?

 21:32

Paul Wilson, for the applicant, the MCO traffic generation, which we discussed earlier, 53 two way trips in the morning, 67 in the evening have been included in the wider prtm model, so therefore encapsulated and attributed to EMG one, as we say, as part of that parent zone approach. So that's been considered as part of the visa modelling. Obviously, we've got the separate test purely to look at the impact based on linsing at that junction as well. So is the question as to how that's then related to the mitigation that we've proposed at that junction? Well, it was said

 22:15

that it was minimal, but it was saying the capacity improvements required to deal with that minimal that allegedly hasn't got an effect.

 22:24

So the mitigation is on the eastern side of the EMG one gyratory, and we're putting an additional right turn lane into the site, and that's because of the volume still of southbound traffic on the A 453, which obviously don't get the benefit in reverse, as we do with the link road that's going in. So that's why that mitigation has come about, and is one of the numerous elements of mitigation over and above that link road that we discussed earlier. If that makes sense,

 22:55

why then do you refer to that in that document to the additional development with the EMG one site?

 23:00

Paul was the applicant. We'll have to, I'll have to review the wording that's gone into that versus what we've put in the transport assessment. Thank you.

 23:19

I'm assuming as far as the highway the county councillors could send up, take County Council, which is quicker than Leicestershire county council, county council, that that's the point you were trying to sort. We sort out earlier. Yeah, can you just confirm that is

 23:33

the case? Harry, Harry horsey, Leicester county council, correct the effectively, the demand for the MC and DCO haven't been separated within the prtm runs, but could be done so through the use of a Linux opposite model for the access

 23:50

I'm assuming. Does national highways wish to make any comments on this particular point?

 23:56

Mid on behalf of national highways? No, I think we mentioned that we've agreed the methodology for this earlier, so we've got no further comments.

 24:05

And finally, continuing for the inputs in Appendix 74, of the TA, AV, P, zero, a, three, the F, em, FM, construction, traffic forecast, modelling assessment. Paragraph 2.34, states there is no E, M, F, M zone in the immediate vicinity of m1 junction 24 could national highways and Leicestershire county council indicate whether they are satisfied with the use of the EM GP one zone as the most appropriate proxies, proxied for the visim modelling.

 24:49

Leicestershire county council, please.

 24:51

Leicester county Councillor Harry horsey, yes, we consider that the most appropriate zone. Thank you.

 24:56

And I'm assuming national highways are the same.

 24:58

Fiona Ahmed, on behalf of National Highways, we'll take this one away and come back to you in writing.

 25:04

Thank you very much. Now we'll move on how those models to have been applied. Obviously, when the application was made the the application was considered against the 2019 pan regional traffic model, prtm principal, because national highways hadn't signed off the 2023, post covid version. We're now that's being a model. Sensitivity is being modelled, and I'm just going to do we know, are we going to get that at deadline? One is the real question is, I need to make clarify, because obviously we need to move that forward. Just confirmation, please.

 25:41

Paul Wilson, for the applicant team, yes, you will get that for deadline one.

 25:48

However, have you got at this stage any high level precis of the results that you could let us have, particularly with the particularly interested in is whether any significant differences and whether any of any junctions which are not originally considered in need of mitigation works that now require them, or conversely, where there is places where mitigation works are no longer required, and say, without formally submitting, have you got those high level results yet?

 26:19

Paul Wilson for the applicant team. The work has been concluded. The results have been shared with national highways, and Leicestershire national highways have signed it off their content with it. The succinct summary is that there is a when you compare it to 2019, prtm, there's less traffic on the local road network, more on the m1 but overall, the vism modelling presents the development in a better light than what is included for in the core TA, based on 2019 so in other words, 2019 which is what has been thoroughly set out part DCA, provides a robust worst case assessment of the two that's been signed off by national highways. Obviously, we have the final piece of information that we owe Leicestershire County Council for the local road network perspective at

 27:07

this stage, do you wish to make any comments the county council and shaking your head, so that's fine, national highways. Do you want to make any comments at this point in our

 27:16

mid on behalf of national highways? No, as per the applicant, we've agreed that Model,

 27:41

there's a number of questions that I'm going to specifically ask. They may because obviously they're going to be based on the 2019 model. They may have been superseding the 2023 version. If that is the situation when you're applying to the question, to the question, could you just ask? Could you make it clear the situation in that whether it's 2019 or 23 version, and if the 23 version is more up to date and more robust, then could I please have that? Could we have that information back, obviously noting it's the 23 to three rather than the 2019 but you will be getting questions based on the 2019 for obvious reasons. That's what we've got.

 28:18

Okay, we've done that,

 28:27

right? We've gone down quite quickly. We're now obviously Leicestershire county council. Leicester county council is concerned to ensure that none of the proposed development, and I'm sure national highways are the same. Would prejudice to deliver if any of the proposed allocations in the emerging local plan, could, I'll bring the boat. You obviously have all three of three parties into this. Could the applicant explain what measures, if any, it has undertaken to ensure that there isn't prejudicing of anything else that's coming further down the line. And if you if you have that any evidence to support such a response.

 29:12

Paul Wilson for the applicant team, we've obviously assessed in detail all of the future draft allocation sites that we're asked to assess, as mentioned earlier, the key piece of mitigation that we're proposing, obviously that link road does help towards the wider betterment in the area. It doesn't resolve everything. Obviously, there's still issues that will need to be resolved from a wider perspective, but in no way will we be prejudicing anything in terms of their delivery. I think the key example is, obviously, there may be a requirement, obviously, for the dualling of the a four or five. And hence why there's been the discussions had about reserving the land, assuming that that is the case, into that

 29:59

in a second, because I'm going to need to bring, I'm going to need to bring, I'm going to bring Prologis and the East Midlands Airport into that one as well. What I'm would bring the highway authorities in a minute. Because obviously, one of the things that I'm sure that local residents will be concerned is that for highway works to be done only six months later than to be dug up again, which A is nothing else is a waste resource, but also tends to wind up local residents considerably, if they've just finished one set of road works with the next lot coming in immediately behind. So that's what, what I'm sure from from so I'm sure Mr. Putting in Mr. Saltons words into his mouth, he would be very concerned about that. Does the county council have any particular comments they wanted to make on preventing prejudice of late, either preventing immediately having to undo something to do something slightly different, or prejudicing future development proposals that might be coming forward.

 30:59

Leicester county councillor, Harry Halsey. This touches on the point that tried to make earlier about it not being a perfect world, and the challenges of strategic planning in a world where you haven't got infinite local plans or strategic strategies to underpin a comprehensive mitigation strategy that said the requirements of an independent developer should be considered in the relevant framework. And I think as a transport Working Group and interested parties, that's entirely what we've tried to do. There's a there's a separate work stream ongoing in terms of a more comprehensive mitigation strategy that could come forward. There's, there's no doubt other work streams in other bodies and organisations already looking at this area. So definite fact that is significant work ongoing to look at this equally. It's an incredibly difficult and challenging thing to bring together, and requires a lot of collaborative work by a lot of people. So in terms of how we as a as a development management part of that wider process, how we can best align ourselves to a overall best situation for everyone. What we've sought to do is work with the applicant team and relevant stakeholders to bring forward a mitigation strategy that ultimately wouldn't be prejudicial to wider growth in that area. So a key aspect of that from our perspective and noting an emerging North West Leicester local plan that probably requires link capacity on the lion in that area, standing from the applicant team, an appropriate methodology for securing land such that a 453, drilling could come forward in the fullness of time, if that isn't part of the development proposals at this stage, where wider work and growth is is to come Forward, obviously at that time, those developments will be considered against what is committed growth at that time, and that will be that will be a challenge and an assessment for them to do them so as a DM party through this process, or we should be wanting the applicant teams that they can mitigate their own impact, if they can take account of wider growth And a strategy that ultimately will allow for greater growth in that area and a more comprehensive delivery of a free port designation, and that's something we would want to support. So as far as we understand at this stage, the strategic package of mitigation is proposed to not only mitigate SEGRO zone impacts, but also safeguard land such that should especially residential growth come forward later, there wouldn't be issues with ransom strips or an inability to deliver link capacity improvements later. So I think I'd summarise that as saying that stakeholder working group are doing the best that they can in the less than perfect scenario that we're that we're in,

 33:42

and whether you'll be able to say it now or later in during the exam is you say, let you know whether or not where we've got to by the end of the exam be able to say as it's stood at that point in time. It wouldn't prejudice the future as it stood at that point.

 34:00

Yeah, so we verbally have had commitment to an approach that we think will be in terms of link capacity improvements would would work, but until such time as that's a formal submission as part of this examination, we obviously can't provide a formal position based on it

 34:15

and national highways. Do you have any views on on this before we move

 34:22

in Ahmed, representing national highways. And, no, I think I mentioned before that we that we're working with the consortium of developers in terms of the more strategic piece for junction 24 which is still yet to be agreed. And we've, as mentioned, we've already suggested that this, the mitigation for this development could form part of that in the future.

 34:47

Thank you. We've just mentioned about the possible duelling, about of the of the A 453, to the of the EM two, of the application site and north of the joint application site, possibly, I think, it was expected to be jewelled in in conjunction with other development and the applications, the applicants to our scheme have indicated, though this would be enabled or facilitated as part of this development, Could the applicants confirm what their current position is, and if so, how would it be secured?

 35:29

Sir Alexander booth, on behalf of the applicant, I mean, the position is, as you've rightly said, we don't understand that dualling of the a 453, north of our site is necessary to deliver our development. We're not proposing to do it, but what we do

 35:44

will not preclude

 35:46

such duelling works taking place at the later stage, if the county council wish to see them delivered, in terms of securing that, I mean, we'd be happy to speak to the county council about amendment, but certainly, sorry,

 36:01

hang on. Sorry, Sir Richard Elling, on behalf of the applicant, if I can just assist Mr. Booth on that point, we have had conversations with the county council regarding potential safeguarding of land so as not to prejudice any future drilling proposals, should they come forward. And we've tabled wording, which we've agreed between ourselves to go in as a requirement which would be included in the next edition of draft eco at deadline two.

 36:37

Obviously need to see the wording of it to make sure it meets the relevant tests, because obviously the parameters plan as double 06 D does have a hatched area on that which does preclude development. I'm assuming that's what would the area in question if that plan could be popped up as 00, 6d parameters plan.

 37:05

So Richard Ellingham, half the applicant. I'm also controlling the screens up, and then we'll get it up if you want. But I might be able to take the point more swiftly if I can. It's not the same as that area, right? But a plan has been tabled between ourselves and the wording proposed in the requirement refers to the new plan, which isn't before the examination currently, but would come in along with the updated draft DCO I'd suggest at deadline two, because it seems a bit peculiar to put the plan in at deadline one and then the wording to follow it now I

 37:41

can understand that clearly I'm interested to know whether or not the joint application would be making similar provision or not. I'll leave it Which of you, which of you wishes to answer.

 37:55

I'll have a go at that here with Philpot Casey on behalf of Prologis. So at this point, I'm going to turn to Mr. Mark Taylor on my left, who I introduced at the start of the hearing, who can explain the approach taken in the joint application. I'm going to try and move the microphone. Forgive me if this all goes horribly wrong.

 38:19

Good afternoon. Excuse me, Mr. Martin Taylor, on behalf of the applicant, sorry, the the Prologis team, apologies, just to explain, yes, our joint application has taken account of duelling. Along that stretch, we have allowed a safeguarded strip of land from finger farm heading in a west bound direction all the way through along the frontage of our site, which would allow for a dual a, 453, as we have discussed previously with the County Council. Thank you. As part of one of written questions we're asking of the district council that they provide us with a complete copy of your application, as it stands at the moment,

 38:58

could you provide us with the

 39:01

plan, because I assume, well, forms currently form part of the formal application or not. But could you provide us with a plan and what and whatever mechanism you consider you that would be delivered by? Because clearly, we obviously need to check both the legalities and the policy position of that. That's fine. We will commit to doing so. Yes, thank you. If you if you could put that, we can put that down as an action point. If we could have that at deadline, one, I don't think that makes difference between the the what the applicant is doing. I don't think that prejudices either party, because this dealing with slightly different things in that context. No problem. Thank you.

 39:44

I'm assuming there wouldn't be, whether I'm just asking our app, the applicant, on this on the DCO, whether or not there would need to be anything marking that in the in the environmental statement. Clearly, what I'm interested in is part of the proposals at the moment are to have a landscaping strip along the northern part of the site, which, if is part that was to be lost to a dual carriageway, but there might be a somewhat different environmental impact, or whether or not there's essentially a court In sanitaire and then the landscaping comes behind it, the

 40:20

sorry, Richard, telling on behalf of the applicant, we were just standing on ceremony and deciding who was going to speak. So yeah, in terms of the safe gun, it is an area that is at the front of the site. But in terms of assessment, as to loss of if there is any landscaping in that area. Obviously, that would come forward as part of proposals, once the tooling would be known at this point in time. We don't know. So, of course, we can only put forward what we require for our scheme.

 40:55

Yeah, it's in your terms. It's an incoming proposal at this point in time. Yes, sir.

 41:06

I'd like to now have a move on to departures from Highway standards. My understanding of case law is that a situation such as this, if a fundamental design approach has been agreed with the heart with the Highway Authority involved in the decision making, even though they aren't the decision maker. If it is, then it is not, then open to the highway authority to say that because the proposal doesn't meet its particular standards, it can't be approved. The case law rates the handling country planning, but I can't anything of a reason why it wouldn't apply it under the Planning Act, 2008 the applicants have set out various departures from standards to highways in appendices 26 and 27 of the TA could the applicant please get those two documents ready for display? We may or may not need them, but if you could get them ready, that's appendices 26 and 27 of the TAA. They're in a double P 082 in the letter at procedural deadline, a the applicant indicated that absent signage issues, which I understand entirely have coming up behind because you've got to sort the departures out for the physical departures out first 11, eight of the 11 departures had been identified, had been agreed with three under discussion. I was slightly confused as that in my reading of the two appendices, there were 14 such departures, 11 raised into the strategic rail net road network, as set out in Appendix three of appendix 27 of the TA and three relating to the road, local road network in relation to in Appendix 26 Can you help me

 42:45

on that? Alexander booth for the applicant, it's going to be Mr. Sim hilditch Rather than Mr.

 42:50

Wilson. Yes. Thank you. Simon hilditch for the applicant, if I may, start with the local road network. Yes. The appendix for the geometrical compliance assessment for the local road network was funded. There has obviously been design evolution, and as just the right thing to do, we've worked with the county council and been able to remove those departures from the design, and therefore that super effectively is superseded, and there will be a revised version of that appendix submitted at deadline one to confirm that. So I think that's there.

 43:30

So they were for there were 14. There are now 11, and they're all and they all relate to the strategic,

 43:37

yes, all of the departures on the local road network have been, been removed through various minor tweaks. Let's put it like that, to achieve compliance, and that design layout has now been agreed with with the county

 43:51

council, obviously, since I'm going to check that with

 43:54

the county council, Leicestershire county council, horrors. I think your question was, there's 14 in total, three of which are on the Irn. That is correct, the three that were with us on the Irn don't form part of the capacity work that's ongoing. So notwithstanding, anything that that might lead to the three that were with us have been resolved through proactive discussion with Mr. Hilditch and colleagues.

 44:20

So So we've now just got the the three outstanding, as far as you're concerned, is that, is that correct? Yes.

 44:27

Simon hilditch, for the for the applicant. So hopefully that makes the maths correct. And then of the the 11 on the national highways network, excluding the signs and signals ones, and eight of those are approved, and three of them are still under review by national highways, going through their independent road safety specialist, Team SES, as they are known, we expect, based on the data that we'll have response by them. Their internal deadline, I believe, is towards the beginning of April. Obviously, if matters get resolved sooner, and they may respond sooner, then found the update, inclusive of those five, three will form the submission for deadline one, but that the worst case for deadline one, you'll get the updated appendix with those eight confirmed, being approved with the three outstanding. Hopefully that clarifies the question.

 45:24

Thank you. Can I just check with national highways that's their understanding of the situation that's present as well?

 45:31

Ian Ahmed on behalf of National Highways, yes, what Mr. Hilditch has said is correct. There are three outstanding publishers that are being reviewed by specialist teams within national highways. And, yeah, it's early April, and my understanding for the deadline for that. Thank you very much.

 45:50

Moving on to road safety audits, my understanding, obviously, there was a need for stage one state road safety audits. They have now been done and submitted to the highway authorities, and allegedly, and we'll do the round the houses and second agreed, obviously, and but there will be some necessary changes to various highway elements as a result of the response to the road Safe audits that are due to become coming in.

 46:24

I'll do the do it in two stages. Firstly, I'll Is

 46:28

that correct? Is that where you've got to? And then we'll work out, have a discussion of the timetable, when they're going to be submitted. So we'll start. We'll start. We'll go. Start with the county council. Are you content with where we are at the moment, having what I've just said?

 46:46

Harry haws, Leicester county council, you're quite correct. Subject same point as before, on the departure subject to the Irn work notwithstanding, then yes, the RSA points, as we are, have been agreed and returned

 46:58

and for national highways? Again?

 47:04

Ahmed on behalf of National Highways, yes, that's correct. We've reviewed the Road Safety Audit, and we've agreed the decision response as well. So it's all been completed and signed off by national highways.

 47:14

Thank you very much. Obviously, we will expect the road safety audits and the responses and designs responses, etc, all the normal stuff to be submitted into the exam deadline. One is, should that be sufficient for the Road Safety Office? We'll come to a second question as to whether that's when we'll get the Tweak to drawings.

 47:32

Simon hilditch for the applicant, yes, the Road Safety Audit designed response has been signed by both Leicestershire and therefore is effectively available now. So therefore it will be submitted for deadline, one into the examination

 47:46

and the revised drawings, taking account

 47:48

there are a small number of minor changes and the substantial work has been done on those already with the local road network. They Leicestershire county council, have already seen those and agreed those as part of the highway design pack with national highways. They'll be issued to them very, very shortly for their review, but they've agreed the principles of those as part of the safety audit. So again, I believe they will be provided for

 48:12

deadline one. So hopefully they'll be submitted at deadline ones. That is the firm intention. That's the firm intention. We'll mark it down as an action that they're coming in at that point in time. Obviously things might change. We'll see how we're going. Should we doing? Okay, time wise, looking down there, I was moving sustainable transport strategy, and we had this discussion earlier about the applicant, not as it's standing at the moment, proposing a bus through essentially, from EMG to em to em, to along the public highway between the two. And saying, the reason for that was that, essentially, the that there was going to be there was public transport in availability in between the two. Now thinking about that and thinking, well, that's fine, that's well and good. But what happens if you've just missed the you get on the internal bus, you get to the bus stop. Just missed the next best, missed the next service bus. You're waiting quarter now, to the next one. You arrive at the next the other site. Oh, bother. I've just missed the internal bus, and you've wasted half an hour of your journey. That was going to be extremely un counterproductive and unknown incentive to people to do that. I was wondering, why haven't you gone that stage further and gone to the straight the through bus come on to a better expression.

 49:44

Thank you for that. Alexander booth, on behalf of the applicant, just to introduce the last of the team who's going to assist the panel today, and that is Stephanie Myers of ITP, who is going to be dealing with sustainable travel and travel plan matters. I'm going to let her address that, but to the extent I need to I can come back also.

 50:04

Thank you for the opportunity to speak. Can you hear me? Okay, yeah, brilliant. In terms of the connectivity between the two sites, the buses, the two bus hubs, so EMG one and AMG two, there's four services, and they're really high frequency. So one of those runs every 15 minutes, the other one every 30 minutes, the third one, three buses an hour, and then the fourth one is hourly. So there are 10

 50:34

cough appeared at the time with the last one. I missed the missed the frequency.

 50:37

The last one was hourly. So between them, that frequency means that there's 10 services running between the two sites every hour during the day, and that's one way, and they also come the other way. So 20 in total. So beat that didn't necessarily feel that there was the need to have a shuttle bus as well, because the buses were so frequent. And then within the sites, the internal shuttle buses at EMG one, it operates every 15 minutes, so it's effectively a turn up and go service. So although yes, they would need to change buses because they're so frequent, the thinking was that actually it was just quick for them to use those public buses.

 51:19

But even so, it would also act as a disincentive, since they would have to pay for the service bus when the other two buses are free,

 51:27

that is a good point. And I think if there was sorry, I should introduce myself, Stephanie Mayers, on behalf of the applicant as part of the travel plan. If we felt that there was sufficient demand of employees moving between the two sites, this could be looked at as part of a ticketing discount, potentially, because people would be making short harp, I think it's three minutes on the bus between the two sides. Obviously.

 51:52

Does the county council have any comments on that particular obviously, from its probably for its public service point of view,

 52:00

Harry haws Leicester county council, only to say it's a good point, and one we raised previously, and wanted to make the point around the if it was a service bus, the additional cost element of a potential user of that could be prohibitive and something that may dissuade use. So they're all to be considered.

 52:19

Yeah, I've made, I've made the point. Obviously I've asked you to go away and have a consideration of them, because clearly you accept it slightly sub optimal, because, by the way, you're not having one running through. But so obviously we take that into account. One of the other things was in Table three of the TA on, which is on a double P Oh, eight, oh on PD PDF page 47 it's noted the percentage of employees driving alone the EMG one site has increased between 2023 and 2024 obviously, we haven't got the 2025 figures yet, and the percentage of individually airing cars is reduced. Have you undertaken any analysis of why that's occurred and what measures have been introduced to reverse this, and does it have any implications for the operation of the sustainable transport strategy for EMG two

 53:13

Stephanie Mayers, on behalf of the applicant, sorry,

 53:18

you are right. There has been a slight increase in the number of single occupancy vehicle trips to the site and the mode share, in terms of the analysis that's been undertaken, we do look at that on a plot specific basis as well, so we can understand for each of the different occupiers, where the fluctuations are in that modal share. It's not been reported yet, but we do now have the 2025 analysis, which shows that SOV has dropped and sustainable share has increased, and that could be submitted as evidence. If that's helpful, would

 53:54

be useful, because it would show that up and if, and equally well, if there were any interventions that one to taken in the 24 to 25 period, if those could be detailed, because clearly that might be useful. And they made it those, those interventions included in the first place in the sustainable transport strategy for EMG to you won't create problems. You're going to then have to fix, as it were. The next one I had was in paragraph 7.56 of the sustainable transport strategy. It's said that there'll be no public parking permitted along the estate roads of EMG two. How was private land? I was how was wondering how that was going to be enforced and secured? I

 55:07

Sorry about that. Stephanie Mayers, on behalf of the applicant, in terms of, in terms of the parking restrictions along the main estate Road, there'd be 24 hour security and double Yellen along the length of the estate Road, which is consistent with what we have at EMG one as well.

 55:26

Eagerly, they are just paint on a road.

 55:32

Stephanie Mayers, on behalf of the applicant, that they are enforced in terms of the on site security, security team,

 55:46

Team. I'm going to step into the brief Sir Alex booth only because I have the functioning microphone. And that is so to say that it isn't it is enforced internally at EMG one and but there is no issue there. I There is no on site parking. And so whilst this may theoretically be a risk, we don't see that this is anything that need, in practical terms, detain the panel or the Secretary of State because it it simply doesn't occur. But we can give further consideration as to how it can be prevented if you really wish to do that. But I mean, CTV is suggested as an obvious mechanism to address it.

 56:27

Thank you. It was just, it was it was something. Was something. I thought, sorry, the thing up. How's that going to be enforced? You know? And in the East Midlands, Freeport, relevant rep, they noted quotes, the DCO applicant has proposed providing for the shuttle bus stop close to Diceworth, which would allow the general public to use the shuttle bus free of charge to get the interchange to use local services. Could you the applicant please prefer confirm its position on this, and if it is an agreement how this would be secured in perpetuity?

 56:59

Sorry, sir, I do have to apologise, because actually trying to read something while you began that question, might you repeat it, please?

 57:06

Certainly in the East Midlands, Freeport rep, relevant rep, it is noted quotes the DCO applicant has proposed providing for the shuttle bus stop close to Diceworth, which would allow the general public to use the shuttle bus free of charge to get to the interchange to use the loan quote. Could the applicants please confirm what your position is on that, and if it is an agreement to it being done, how it will be secured in perpetuity?

 57:34

Stephanie Mayers, on behalf of the applicant, the shuttle bus funding would be secured through the management charge for the site, meaning it would be available beyond the duration of the travel plan period.

 57:47

There's been nothing to stop anybody walking in from Diceworth to just hopping on the bus.

 57:51

Stephanie May is on behalf of the applicant, no same as an EMG one as well,

 57:56

because obviously they're public. There was the public rights of ways run run to and from the side. So that's not a problem.

 58:06

I'm just looking at the time.

 58:10

Yeah, I think we could probably do get through them.

 58:14

The next one's the framework travel plan.

 58:18

If we get, could you get the framework travel plan up, which is a double P, 085,

 58:28

sorry. Thank you. And if you go down, it's page. If you start on page 35 but it trans, it's the bit of funding. It's the bit that's scroll over the page now down into 36 that bit. Yeah, thank you. You've set out the funding for the travel plan and the bus fund. What we'd like, I'd like, to know is how the value of those funds, that's the 850,000 for the travel plan pan, pan plan Fund and the 1.4 5 million for the bus fund have been calculated. I'm particularly interested in how they fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the development being permitted, and whether they would be sufficient for their purposes.

 59:16

Stephanie Mayers on behalf of the applicant, so the EMG two travel plan fund has been drawn on evidence from EMG one. So EMG one, there were funds of 1.7 million for the public transport fund and a million for the travel plan fund. Taking those values and how successful that development has been in achieving the mode share targets, we've created a per head investment for EMG two based on the number of employees that will be in that site. So whilst the value is slightly smaller, that's scaled relative the size of the development in terms of the bus fund, the same has been applied in terms of the per head calculation, and we've also had discussions with the local bus operators to verify that the value of the funds is sufficient to invest in future improvements to the network.

 1:00:19

Thank you. Does the county council have anything, any comment on that?

 1:00:23

Leicester county Councillor Harry horses, just say, I think that there's a wider point in around securing of funds and how that's managed, and then also what proportion of existing services are commercially operated, therefore, what could need to be picked up through subsidy? And then what, especially from our perspective, what part in that process we may or may not be required to do. So think it'd be useful to pick that work stream up over the course the examination to explore further how it's best secured.

 1:00:52

Thank you. I'm grateful if you could the two parties could liaise on that. The fact it was based on the EMG one figure sort of presupposes the question as to, where did that come from? You know, you may that question obviously may or may not have been asked in the first, in the first and the EMG one, DCO hearings, Alex

 1:01:13

booth for the applicant. No, I don't have the answer to that, but I suppose the short answer would be that in circumstances where wherever that figure came from. It worked. And when one looks at the numbers the target and how far the numbers surpass that target, we say it provides itself and baseline, but we'll certainly make inquiries to understand what the position was.

 1:01:32

At a very technical point, it's noted that both will be index linked, but it's not clear how the sums will be provided, what the base state where is, whether they're going to be held in separate interest bearing accounts, with interest used for specific purposes, whether it be provided in phases and called down, or what I think I could do with a bit more information on that sort of if that's possible.

 1:01:57

Alexander booth, for the applicant, yes, sir, we'll seek to provide you with some further particulars as regards those

 1:02:05

details, actually doing quite nearly well. My next question relates to how long the travel plans for individual units would last. The overall traffic generation figures are for the long term been set up on the basis that they'd be affected for the lifetime of development. But but I'm also concerned about how long they would be, because I've heard room things about the travel plans five years from initial occupation. Secondly, what happens if you then get a subsequent occupier coming in the building's relets, perhaps number of times consecutively. What I could you help me to make sure that and I understand what to stand is how the track, how long the travel plan would last, whether it's going to be in perpetuity. Effectively, what would happen as subsequent occupiers take over buildings first occupy fine, but what happens when next person comes in behind, etc, etc. Can you help

 1:03:08

Stephanie Mayers on behalf of the applicant,

 1:03:12

I could help perhaps set the context in terms of how it's operating at East Midlands gateway one, because we're proposing similar for the gateway two. So the travel plan there is being delivered and monitored over a 10 year period. So that's from the first occupation of unit running through to the final occupation of the final unit. And that's taken us quite neatly to a 10 year delivery and monitoring period as well. Each of the end occupiers that comes forward develops their own occupier travel plan, which complies with the framework travel plan or with the intention of meeting the site wide travel plan targets by year 10, the end of the travel plan period

 1:04:04

work with subsequent app requires. Are they under the same obligation to do that essentially as their predecessors?

 1:04:18

We can follow up with that in writing. If that's okay,

 1:04:21

be fine, if we can put that down as to is to how it's ensuring that travel plan, the travel plans, are effective for the lifetime of the development, rather than just for that

 1:04:32

occupies, yes, so we'll come back on in writing on that. Thank you.

 1:04:38

Leicestershire county council,

 1:04:41

Leicester county Sorry, just one quick point on that. My understanding, I think, is the EMG one included a section 106, to pay for travel by monitoring by LCC. So I suppose in terms of the wider discussions and thought process, it'd be useful to understand if that was to be replicated on the MG two as well. Thank you.

 1:05:00

Certainly Alexander booth, and please don't explore that with LTC now.

 1:05:04

Thank you. And that will then come forward. If you could, if we can have an, at least an update as to where you've got to by deadline one. Yeah, I'm not necessarily saying it has to be concluded by deadline one, but it would just be at least, though the things are moving in the right direction. That's all. Thank you. I've just about come to the end of all the questions. I think the only person is Mr. Sutton, would you would put your hand up indicating you wish to speak? So if we're going with those, if

 1:05:34

you could possibly, I

 1:05:45

to assessor District Council.

 1:05:48

So these are thoughts will be a little bit disorganised, so forgive me, but it is predicated on not being able to be here tomorrow. So their effect, they may appear to be fairly random. I looked up the a one Morpeth arrangement that you mentioned yesterday may or may not be relevant. It may be going back a step, but nonetheless, I think it's important to say that I've been surprised today not to have heard anything about notwithstanding the commercial aspects and the and the arguments about the two parts of EMG to site, transport, economic efficiency, appraisal and benefit cost ratio seem to have been key points, albeit that will be to do with the public purse, and we've heard little so far about the role of the public person. Mr.

 1:06:34

Sutton, we are this part of the agenda is dealing with traffic and transport only. I could you limit your point just to that, please,

 1:06:43

I will content myself then and put on the rest in written representations, in repeating just a few words from the parish Council's initial representation, which might sum up some of My concerns. I'm particularly concerned about the interactions, having listened links between the local road network and the strategic road network, and the interactions between Leicestershire county council and national Highlanders. And that is, given the amount of work that has gone behind the scenes, and we don't have the data and so on that's come out quite a lot. The parish council said national highway should be leading on the junction design and future proofing. And I would, as an aside there, say future proofing to me, given the lifespan of some of the things that have been looked include thoughts about the land around junction 24 which is at a premium the recent safeguarding of HS two and so on, on similar land, similarly located, and shows at what a premium it is in strategic terms. That's just an aside chair, they say the parish council goes on to say integrated National Traffic modelling outputs with local local traffic data from county source is key, and I will during the course of the examination, much more about how the data from the two sets of modelling interacts, whether it's for short term mitigation measures. And I haven't teased out in my mind what short term and longer term mitigation measures might be, because a lot of the discussion is heading in that direction of acceptance based on short term mitigation rather than complete schemes taken through to completion. And they the parish council ends that with the need to Denise modelling data, which we've already mentioned. They do say that local road users who know the road system and its interdependencies and issues that can arise should be consulted. That's a big ask in the context of this, but I would emphasise again, especially given the sensitivities of the interaction between the strategic and national aspects of this, and it's already been highlighted in practical terms, what happens if one carriageway of the m1, A, 453, to Nottingham is affected? I hope the risk assessments associated with all the models are plain and part of what we see as well and the stress testing of those models. Thank you, sir.

 1:09:20

Thank you, Councillor Sutton, can I just have we just have a two minute while we have a quick chat ourselves? Don't think we need to form the adjourn. It's to do with how we deal with action points. Do

 1:10:17

right? What we've what we've just decided, is that rather than go through all the action points from the whole whole of today, will given the time. We will. What we'll do is we'll essentially hold them over. And we don't think we're going to have because cause any problems, really, because everybody's going to be represented tomorrow, who's here? He's gone, there's an action point. He's going to be on them. We'll do them, essentially, at this point, at the end of is h2 tomorrow, because that's not going to take all day. We know that it's not. It's just It won't. So if we do it like unless anybody's got an objection to that, if we just do that, we'll go through them all tomorrow. We've got a bit more time when we can, therefore, make sure everybody's up to date and a full understanding of the action points we're setting, asking people to do. Is everybody happy with that? Since you're online, I better just check that with national highways to make sure you're contented that approach too.

 1:11:11

Half national highways. Yes, we're happy with that approach. Thank you.

 1:11:15

In which case, I think we've got anybody else thing else, anybody else wishes to raise. In which case? Thank you everybody. It's been a long day, but we've done it. Thank you everybody. I suspect, obviously, if goodly proportional to you, tomorrow morning, at 10 o'clock, we resume for the issue specific hearing on the development consent order and the material change order. Until then, have a good night and this, this issue specific hearing is closed.